

Vol. 9 No. 1

March 1987

THE STAR OF THE EAST



ܟܠܗ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ

an ecumenical journal dealing specially with
the oriental and eastern orthodox churches

THE STAR OF THE EAST

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ

An ecumenical journal dealing specially with
the Oriental and Eastern Orthodox Churches

THE DELHI ORTHODOX CENTRE
2, Tughlakabad Institutional Area
New Delhi-110 062

CHIEF EDITOR

Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios

EDITOR

Revd. Dr. K. M. George

EDITORIAL BOARD

H.G. Mathews Mar Coorilos	Dr Philipose Mar Theophilos
H.G. Geevarghese Mar Osthathios	Revd. Dr. V.C. Samuel
Revd. Fr. K. G. Thomas	Revd. C.G. Geevarghese
Revd. Fr. T.J. Joshua	Revd. Fr. M. Jacob Kurian
Mr. P. A. Oommen	Mr. K.M. Mathew

EDITORIAL ADVISORS

Revd. Fr. Stewart, Cambridge Brotherhood, Delhi-6
Revd. Fr. Hambye S.J., Vidya Jyothi, Delhi-6
Very Revd. Archpriest Vitaly Borovoi
Revd. Fr. Ion Bria, C.W.M.E, W.C.C., Geneva

BUSINESS MANAGER

Revd. George Paulose

THE STAR OF THE EAST

Vol. 9. No. 1

March 1987

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Editorial	i
2. Ecclesiastical Authority Options and Patterns in the Indian Orthodox Church —Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios	1
3. Scientific Positivism, the New Dualism, and the Perennial Wisdom —Dr. Willis W. Harman	9
4. An Appeal to all people —A Document	26
5. News and Notes	31

ow
ere
nal
it's
he
od
to
—
on,
oul
or
by

ep
at
lhi
ze
tic
he
nd
re
or

ial
n-
tly
on.
ler
xt
at.
es.

Editorial

THE STATUE AND ITS SHADOW

What is wrong with India? What is she heading for? How long will the country hold together? Answers differ. But there is no dearth of questions in a land where violence and communal riots are the order of the day. Violence erupts in a moment's notice. Communal carnage is carried out in cold blood. The land of non-violence bleeds, and bleeds profusely with the blood of innocents. Indian masses have apparently lost all capacity to be shocked by anything. Perhaps this is the true Indian tradition—total passivity before death and birth, killing and annihilation, poverty and injustice! Yet there is something of the Indian soul which cries out, though feebly, for an answer, for justice and for the warmth of mutual love now lost to the millions living side by side.

People in high places give answers to people. But they keep changing answers as well. They know and the people know that the answers are just lame. Just a few months ago Rajiv Gandhi told people that religion was the culprit. Shun religion, privatize it, keep it in the seclusion of 'individual' reserves—was his frantic call to the nation. Now he sees foreign hands that destabilize the country, invisible hands that work havoc with the peace and integrity of the nation. Communal violence and disintegration are direct operations of the foreign devil. Poor religion is excused for the moment.

There is a relationship between religion and the communal virus. Nation's intellectuals are divided in defining that relationship. While one set of thinkers assert that religion is directly responsible and banishing religion from public life is the solution. The other side argues that no authentic religion or religious leader preaches violence. But the name of religion is used as a pretext by political self-seekers. Religion, therefore, is totally innocent. Other opinions of mixed shades appear in between these two poles.

In fact, the relationship is ambiguous and very elusive. It is something like a statue and its shadow. Is the statue responsible for its shadow. Yes and No. There is the shadow because there is the statue. But the real responsibility lies with source of light that shapes a shadow out of a statue. This third force is the crucial factor. So is it in Indian politics. There are powers that cast sinister shadows out of anything, more especially out of religion without religion ever knowing it. The task before India is to identify these sources of "light" that create shadows of "darkness". The political leaders will never help us in identifying it. There is a whole substratum of powers that align with them. But the ordinary people are still capable for it. Goodness and generosity still exist amidst them. The answer to India's questions lies with the common sense of our people and the depth of humanity that they have been practising for centuries between individuals and communities.

ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY OPTIONS AND PATTERNS IN THE INDIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

(Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios)

Who speaks for the Church? Can church authorities tell members of the church what positions to take on any given social, cultural, political or economic issue? On an issue like world peace, how can a church speak authoritatively, and what is the meaning or value of such speaking? Such are some of the questions to which this paper would like to give some attention in the context of the present practice in the Orthodox Church in India.

The Orthodox Conception of Authority—Some General Remarks

The word and concept of "authority" have their roots in the history of the western (Roman Catholic) or European Church.

Auctoritas, the Latin word from which the English word authority is derived, referred originally to *auctors*, or authors whose writings could be adduced as support to an argument in a theological *disputatio* or dispute.

This practice of citing wise men or classical writings to prove one's point seems to be as old as a literate culture, if not older. Christ himself often cited the prophets and Old Testament writings in support of his teaching, or in arguments with the Tempter or with the Scribes and Pharisees. (e.g. John 6:45; 8:17; 10:34 Lukose 4:8, 12, etc.). But Jesus did not lean so much on scriptural authority but on what God the Father was doing and saying.

"And Jesus answered and said to them: 'My teaching is not my own, but of Him who has sent me. If anyone wills to do His will, that person shall know whether this teaching is from God or whether I am speaking on my own.'"

(John 7:16)

The authority of Jesus was a self-authenticating one; not legal or constitutional.

In the New Testament as a whole "authority" means something else. It is *exousia* or power to do things, to rule and direct life, to heal and to cast out demons.

"And coming forward Jesus spoke to them (the eleven Apostles) saying: To me is given all authority (*exousia*) in heaven and on earth. Go forth and teach all the nations..."

(Matthew 28: 18-19).

This kind of authority is not academic or intellectual, but the power to rule, to teach and to perform. Jesus "taught as having power" (Mt 7:29, Lk 4:32, Mk. 1:22,27.) a new kind of teaching, far from our present academic understanding of authority. The most manifest expressions of this authority are the power to forgive sins (Mt. 9:6, Mk. 2:10, Lk. 5:24), power to cast out demons. (Mt. 10:1, Mk.6:7, 3:15, Lk. 9:1 etc), and the power to heal or give life. This is the power which Jesus gave to his disciples (Lk. 9:1. 10:19) and thus to his Church. It is the power to become children of God (John 1:12), power over the demonic forces of darkness (Mk 16:17 ff), power to build up the church (2 Corint. 10:8, 13:10), and power over sin and death.

This kind of authority is more important for the church, than the authority to make statements and pronouncements. And the pronouncements themselves would become more self-authenticating when accompanied by the power to forgive, the power to heal, the power to cast out demonic forces, the power to build up the community, and the power to give life.

The Conciliar Nature of Authority in the Church

When the Church had to make declarations and decisions of some significance, it is to the Council of the Church and to the guidance of the Holy Spirit that the early Church resorted. But this conciliar authority is often misunderstood, when seen as vested in an Episcopal Synod as an institution. The clearest example is the first Jerusalem Council described in Acts 15.

The dispute was about the role of the Law of Moses in the life of the Christian church. It was a party within the Church of Judacan Christian that taught that no one can be saved without being circumcised according to the law of Moses (15:1). The Apostles and the Elders were gathered together in Council; they disputed and discussed. The ordinary lay brothers and sisters were also present presumably, because the decision to send a team to Antioch and Syria and Cilicia was taken by the "whole church with the apostles and the elders" (15:22,23)

In fact the conciliar nature of authority was exercised not by the apostles and elders in isolation from the rest of the Church, but along with and on behalf of the whole church. Even in conciliar decrees like that of Nicea or Chalcedon, the fact that only bishops have signed the decree does not mean that bishops made decisions in isolation.

A church council, according to the Orthodox tradition, should consist of representatives of all sectors in the Church—bishops, presbyters, deacons and laity. Recent scholarship has shown that the Council of Nicea had some 3000 participants, though only around 300 bishops seem to have signed. As everyone knows, the leading theological role at the Nicean Council was played by one who was not then a bishop—the young Alexandrian deacon Athanasius. He was of course secretary to the bishop of Alexandria, but bishop's secretaries do not dominate a theological debate if only bishops had been present and deliberating. There must have been present at Nicea a very large number of presbyters, deacons and lay people, who together constituted 90% of the Council.

Conciliarity was the principle of authority in the early church. No one person had authority to speak or act for the Church. The bishop could act only with his college of presbyters and deacons, and with the consent of the whole of the Church. When the Apostles set up churches in the first century, they appointed a college of presbyters or elders with the bishop as presiding elder. Decisions were made, not by democratic majority, but by consensus in the Holy Spirit. To do all things together in conciliar community belongs to the very nature of the Church as Christ's body.

Present Practice in the Indian Church

The Orthodox Church in India had developed a polity that is in some ways more democratic than in other Eastern churches. For example, all bishops, including the Catholicos, have to be elected by an assembly with two laymen and one priest elected by each congregation in the whole church. This assembly, called the malankara Association has thus some 3000 members of whom two-thirds are laymen. It has also a democratic set-up for managing the properties of the church and for its budget and accounts.

But official statements are usually issued by the Holy Episcopal Synod when it is in session. Very rarely, however, does the Synod of bishops so declare their minds. It may sometimes issue a statement on famine in Africa or alcoholism and temperance in India. It may even pronounce itself on property related questions like the Christian Succession Act or the Dowry System. But on burning social issues like growing injustice in society, persistent poverty, and the stench of corruption in Government the Synod seldom speaks.

Technologically there should be no objection to such speaking. One may be afraid to antagonize some Christian vested interests by speaking up too analytically about the structures of injustice, oppression and exploitation in society. Generally the bishops prefer to remain on a plane of general piety than to risk controversial pronouncements.

Behind such reluctance to make analytical social pronouncements there may be also some diffidence on the part of the bishops about their own competence in such matters.

The Constitution of the Church clearly says that the Episcopal synod is the final authority in interpreting all matters of "faith, order and discipline". Social questions are seldom seen as falling within these categories.

Even the issues of war and peace, arms race and arms trade, star wars and nuclear weapons seldom find themselves worthy of synodical pronouncements.

Perhaps this pattern may change soon. Perhaps the bishops

will acquire sufficient self-confidence to speak on such issues. The bishops are all fairly well educated people, move at home in the modern world than most other Orthodox bishops elsewhere.

Another reason for such reticence on important human issues is the characteristically Orthodox desire for unanimity in the Holy Episcopal Synod. Some of these social issues can generate controversy and divide the bishops. Most bishops would like to avoid that.

It is also true that the Church does not have, its office structure, a special person or team responsible for studying social questions and preparing possible draft statements to be approved by the bishops.

To put it very briefly, there is little perception of any need or responsibility for the Episcopal Synod to pronounce itself on social, moral or political-economic questions. The Episcopal Synod prefers to leave such matters to the wisdom and discretion of the laity and to the freedom and discernment of individual preachers or priests.

The only exception to this general rule is the Orthodox Student Christian Movement (M G O C S M) and the Orthodox Youth League. These organizations run annual general conferences and periodic regional conferences. There the more socially aware bishops give talks on science and technology, war and peace, poverty and injustice and so on. But the speeches of the bishops have no official status as far as the church structure is concerned. The conference may pass some resolutions on social questions, but these largely go unheeded.

In general, the Orthodox perception is that while it is the responsibility of the Church to preach and to teach the way of Christ to the believers, Church hierarchies have no need to make formal statements taking sides in a moral debate. The laymen and women are intelligent. They should be helped to see the moral and theological aspects of social issues. The hierarchy should not, however, pronounce anything officially on behalf of the laity or require them to take any particular positions; they can make their own decisions.

Is the Present Pattern Adequate?

The present writer is fully convinced that there are three issues at least on which the Church must today speak out—so that its members as well as others may find moral guidance. These three issues are, as the World Council of Churches has shown, Justice, Peace, and Integrity of Creation.

On Justice the Church fathers have been quite vocal. St. John Chrysostom, for example, was prepared to confront the prodigal practices of the nobility in the 4th century and to suffer because he criticized royalty and the rich. But these were never official statements by the Church on such issues.

On questions of war, leaders of local churches have generally sought to justify the wars run by their own principalities and to condemn the enemy—even when the enemy was also Christian. Of course in the earliest period of the Churches' life, Christians refused to wear arms and suffered on that account. But seldom has the Church pronounced itself officially on such matters. The only machinery available for such representative declaration was the ecumenical Council. Some of these Councils have made decisions on specific moral issues but seldom on Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation.

One reason for such silence was the recognition that such matters were primarily the responsibility of the State. And in a monarchical state, the citizen can only petition, not decide.

We are today living in democratic societies, and we cannot dissociate ourselves from responsibility for the State and its decisions. The Church as an organised unity within a democratic structure can speak as the representative of its members.

In the West, however, when the Church speaks, it is not doing so as a Christian lobby. It has had a traditional role as the Conscience-keeper of Society. This role is no longer recognized either by the modern state or by Christians themselves in many cases. Yet many people in the West expect the Church to speak on moral issues, though they may not commit themselves in advance to follow the lines laid down by the Church. European, American

and Australasian societies have possibilities here which do not apply to other societies where Churches have not traditionally played the role of Conscience-keeper.

This issue has to be seen also from the perspective of societies like India, where within the nation as a whole, the Christians constitute only a small minority—2.6% of the population. This minority is recognized by the State as such, and are given certain privileges, like that of running its own institutions (schools, hospitals etc.) and so on.

But the national state in India does not expect the Church to give it any moral guidance. In fact the secular state in India will not accept such guidance even from the leaders of India's majority religion, Hinduism. One reason may be that Hinduism is a collection of various religious schools and has never had a comprehensive organization or structure which could act or speak on behalf of all the schools in Hinduism.

There is also the fact that the Christian Church in India is also badly divided and cannot speak with one voice. If it could manage to come together in some ecumenical conference and speak on social-moral issues like war and peace, its voice would still not be regarded as the voice of India's conscience-keeper. That role would not be conceded even to a united Hindu or inter-religious pronouncement.

In these circumstances the possible purpose of an ecumenical Christian pronouncement, or even the pronouncement by a single church can only be to help in the shaping of public opinion.

The Indian Orthodox Church is privileged in one sense. It has been part of the Indian scene, though a very small part of it, for almost two millennia. It could speak as a national church. However, for the majority of India's people, any Church would be only the representative of a 'foreign' religion and would have thus only a limited influence on the minds of all but its own members.

Despite all these limitations, a clear and well argued presentation on the dangers of nuclear war, on the persistence of poverty

and injustice, and on our responsibility to maintain the delicate eco-balance that sustains life could have an impact on public opinion. If others can perceive that the Church is speaking not to conserve the interests of the Christian minority but rather for the food of all people everywhere, a Church proclamation, can get a limited hearing even among non-Christians.

A case can thus be made out for the Indian Orthodox Church beginning a process of study on these three mutually related issues of Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation as preparatory to an official statement by the Episcopal Synod on these matters. Even if the declaration may not be accepted as binding even on its own members, a dent can be made on the public conscience such a statement will stand or fall on the virtue of its won clarity and coherence, its wisdom and perspicacity, its power to persuade rather than to impose.

Humanity is in grave peril. The dimension of the peril is without precedent. It is only in our time that humanity has developed the technological power to destroy itself and all life on this planet. It is only in our time that the system of exploitation has become global in scope and integrally related to the arms race and arms trade. It is only in our time that our industrial system can threaten to upset the ecological balance so substantially.

It should therefore be possible for the Orthodox Church in India to take this up as a high priority and initiate a study process which will lead to a well-argued case for peace and disarmament, for justice in society and for caring for the biosphere.

The Orthodox Church is not a confessional church and has no such tradition as declaring a moral option as a matter of *status* confessionis. It has, however, always stood for love and compassion for the whole of humanity.

It is in the context of that compassion and love that the Church has to take note of the catastrophic nature of the peril that faces humanity. In that spirit, it can exhort Christians and others to repentance, that is turning away from folly and evil, to prayer, and to compassionate but specific action to change the course of the world.

SCIENTIFIC POSITIVISM, THE NEW DUALISM, AND THE PERENNIAL WISDOM

(Willis W. Harman, Institute of Noetic Sciences, California)

The remarkable advances of modern science have been achieved on a foundation set of metaphysical assumptions which included

- (a) *positivism*—the assumption that what is real is what is physically measurable, and
- (b) *reductionism*—the assumption that scientific understanding is to be found in the reducing of phenomena to more elemental events (such as the motion of elementary particles, or the configuration of an electromagnetic field).

One of the great surprises of the past decade is that the adequacy of these assumptions is being vigorously challenged, and the possibility is being considered of re-erecting science on the basis of a dualistic metaphysic. A third contending idea would base an expanded science in the metaphysic which is found at the core of the world's spiritual traditions, sometimes referred to as the "Perennial Wisdom".

Which way this issue is finally resolved will affect not only science, but every major institution in global society.

Consciousness as Causal Reality

Roger Sperry of the California Institute of Technology shared the 1981 Nobel Prize in Physiology and Medicine for his work in human split-brain studies. Sperry's research, involving extensive observation of patients whose brains had actually been divided by severing the corpus callosum joining the two halves, showed that there are important differences in functioning between the left and right halves of the brain. As an accompaniment to this honor,

Sperry was invited to write the lead article for the 1981 *Annual Review of Neuroscience*. This was entitled "Changing Priorities", and spoke to the importance of a neglected area of science, namely the study of human subjective experience. It noted a profound development, which Sperry described as follows :

"Current concepts of the mind-brain relation involve a direct break with the long-established materialist and behaviorist doctrine that has dominated neuroscience for many decades. Instead of renouncing or ignoring consciousness, the new interpretation gives full recognition to the primacy of inner conscious awareness as a causal reality."

How does science accomodate to "*the primacy of inner conscious awareness as a causal reality*" ? Or must it ? Those are the questions at the heart of the present crisis in science.

Another Nobel laureate, British neurophysiologist Sir John Eccles, also emphasizes the need to deal scientifically with the neglected area of inner conscious awareness. Eccles chides those scientists who would exclude the phenomena of conscious experience from the domain of science as suffering from a "mental scotoma", and urges "a strong dualist hypothesis" in which "primacy is given to the self-conscious mind". He says (in *The Self and Its Brain*, with Karl Popper) : "We have to assume that our self-conscious mind has some coherence with the neuronal operations of the brain, but we have furthermore to recognize that it is not in a passive relationship." Which is another way of saying "the primacy of inner conscious awareness as a causal reality". These words may well go down in history as the rallying cry of a revolution in which science transcends its present positivistic, reductionistic bias.

Few would question that the positivistic, reductionistic bias in science has been a useful one. It was especially so for distinguishing scientific explanations from such prescientific interpretations as the whims of the gods, or the intervention of Divine grace, or "natural" tendencies like the Aristotelian concepts of bodies seeking to come to rest near the center of the universe, and nature abhorring a vacuum.

When the modern world view began to take shape in Western Europe around the 17th century, it involved a revolt of common sense against everything that had come to seem repugnant to it. It was a declaration of faith in the senses as opposed to the speculative mind, and in the visible world as opposed to the unseen. For good reason it emphasized the empirical, as a reaction against the authority of Scholasticism, and the reductionist, as a more fruitful kind of explanation than the medieval concepts of ruling spiritual forces.

There were also ample grounds for science separating the objective, which can be viewed by all, from the subjective, which the individual experiences in the privacy of his own mind—and good reasons to concentrate on the former. One such reason was that concentrating on the objective accelerated scientific progress; but an equally cogent one was to avoid a territorial clash with the institutions of religion, which viewed the soul and spirit as their special domain.

As Western Europe and North America put increasing emphasis on industrializing economic production, they naturally supported research into knowledge that would improve the abilities to predict and control and generate new technologies. This strengthened still further the deterministic and behavioristic tendencies in science.

Thus the issue is not to criticize the past, but rather to ask whether science has outgrown the old bias. The past productiveness of the positivistic, reductionistic bias is not in question. What is in question is the adequacy of this bias to deal with the critical questions of the future.

Challenges to Positivism and Reductionism

As strong as the positivistic and behavioristic biases had become by the mid-twentieth century, there was nonetheless a feeling on the part of many scientists (as well as non-scientists) that something important was being left out. After all, the only experience of reality that we have *directly* is our own conscious awareness. There was something very unnatural about a science which seemed

to deny consciousness as a causal reality when everyday experience seemed to confirm again and again that it is the *decision* to act that causes action.

There were other poses as well that one had to assume, in order to be in accord with the sophisticated scientific view of the day—poses which felt equally artificial. One tried to accept that it is the brain that is real, and conscious awareness is an “epiphenomenon”; that the question “Does mind exist?” was to be taken seriously. The complex products of creative imagination were supposed to have come about through some sort of random recycling of a brain-computer, together with some kind of selection of “best fit”. We were supposed to believe that the complex instinctual behaviors of animals, and complex physiological systems such as the two eyes giving binocular vision, had developed through our evolutionary past exclusively as a result of random mutations plus natural selection.

Besides, there were the anomalies to remind us that all was not well with the orthodox scientific world view. Down through the centuries a variety of anomalous phenomena—including clairvoyant remote viewing, telepathic communication, levitation and teleportation, “instantaneous” spiritual healing, and other so-called “psychic” phenomena—have been reported. Various explanations have been put forth as to why these reports are probably mistaken. Famous and competent scientists have arrayed themselves on both sides of the debate. A half-century ago it seemed fairly clear that in spite of the claims of a few persons doing research in parapsychology or “psychic research”, the better educated and more sophisticated public felt confident that scientific advance was making the genuineness of the phenomena decreasingly plausible. Now the reverse is the case.

What was common to all of these anomalous psychic phenomena was that *mind* seemed to have some effects in the physical world—directly, as in the reported instances of dramatic healing, or indirectly, as in the presumed telepathic communication. But that was true in everyday and commonplace phenomena as well. I decide to raise my right arm, and behold!—it goes up. Attitudes towards one’s work bring about tension and stress, and an ulcer

results. Patients told that a plain sugar pill has curative powers experience remission of the symptoms of their illness (placebo effect). In our everyday experience it would seem strained and artificial to deny that what goes on in our minds has effects on our actions. Yet *as scientists*, more than one generation of students were trained to engage in that denial.

It is in the light of these decades of denial of consciousness as causal reality that Roger Sperry’s pronouncement comes with such impact. It is similar to the impact of Copernicus’ observations after centuries of denying the implications of the familiar experience of watching ships go down over the horizon, and knowing that the positions of the stars in the sky shift as one travels north or south.

The Peculiarity of the Scientific World View

Thus we are led to consider what physicist Erwin Scrodinger termed “the peculiarity of the scientific world view”. This can perhaps be best examined with the aid of the fundamental insight of cultural anthropology.

It is well known to anthropologists that people who grow up in different cultures literally perceive different realities. The phenomenon is basically the same as hypnosis. Accepting a suggestion from a hypnotist, I can be persuaded to perceive something that isn’t there, or to fail to perceive something that is there. I can be led to experience limits not normally encountered (e.g. inability to lift a chair weighing a few pounds); or, I can be led to transcend limits normally there (e.g. use my rigid body as a “human bridge” between two chairs, and support someone’s weight on my stomach). Similarly, people who are “hypnotized” by the suggestions implicit in one culture will perceive differently, experience different limits, etc. from those with a different “cultural hypnosis”.

One pertinent example is the current popularity in the U.S. of firewalking workshops. There had been ample evidence, for many generations, that people in certain cultures traditionally find it possible to walk barefoot over burning coals without hurting their feet. Until the last couple of years, that possibility was not a part

of reality in modern industrial culture. Within the past two years, thousands of well educated professional and business persons have demonstrated to themselves the powers of their minds, by walking unharmed over a bed of burning coals after only a few hours' psychological preparation. This preparation centers around accepting and internalizing the suggestion that the fire will not burn them.

Another example is the phenomenon of clairvoyant "remote viewing" — sending one's mind out as far as hundreds or thousands of miles to "see" what is going on at some remote location. Primitive tribes had long used this ability to check up on distant relatives or strayed cattle, but its possibility was not part of modern cultural reality. Only in the last two decades have military intelligence groups in both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. put the phenomenon to their own uses. (As have archaeologists searching for ruins buried under many feet of sand, and energy companies seeking where to drill for oil). Training to bring out the latent remote-viewing ability consists primarily in overcoming the negative belief that one can't do it — that it is "physically" impossible.

It has been humbling for scientists to come to recognize (as they have been doing in increasing numbers over the past quarter century) that science is in a sense a cultural artifact. A different society, with a different "cultural hypnosis", would have created a different science.

In the first place, the science of any society is biased by the pattern of support — what research gets supported and what does not. A society will support research into areas that are deemed important by that society. Thus an industrializing society supported research into knowledge that would improve abilities to predict and control and generate new technologies. Other areas might be quite neglected—as, for example, the area of human subjective experience.

Besides that, we know from research in hypnosis and other areas of experimental psychology that once a person has an internalized picture of reality, reality thenceforth tends to be experienced in accordance with that picture. Thus, for example, people of a certain ethninc origin tend to be experienced as having characteris-

tics expected of that ethnic group. The hypnotized subject not only sees reality in accordance with the internalized suggestions from the hypnotist, but has very logical-sounding explanations as to why reality "really" is that way. Persons "hypnotized" by a particular culture to perceive reality in the way taught by that culture's prevailing belief system tend to find their experience conforming to the approved "reality". That is true, even when the approved "reality" is termed a scientific world view !

Thus we have the very important dual relationship between the experienced world and the science that is developed. The scientific knowledge that has been gained influences the way we perceive the world. *But*, the way the world is experienced in our culture influences what kind of science gets developed.

This thought — that a society's basic experiencing of reality shapes its science as well as the reverse — may be quite disturbing as one pursues its implications. When the fundamental shift from the Middle Ages to modern times took place — or more particularly, in the scientific revolution of the 17th century — it was not a matter of the older knowledge system (Scholasticism) being proven wrong. Rather, the secularization of values which had been taking place for several centuries had brought the culture to a point where an empirical science served its needs better than the outmoded authoritarian knowledge system.

Improbable as it may seem to many persons, the world appears to be going through another such profound shift, where the changing cultural experiencing of reality is again challenging the older authority system. In this "second Copernican revolution" it is the reassertion of the importance of inner subjective experience that is challenging the adequacy of positivistically biased science. As people have increasingly looked to their own inner experience as the realm in which matters of value and meaning are resolved, as they increasingly look to their own deep intuition as the ultimate authority, the "secret" has been more and more openly shared: *The world of experience does not conform to the "reality" they taught us in science class!*

Thus, just as "the earth goes around the sun" became the some-

what inadequate summary of the Copernican revolution, so "consciousness as causal reality" is that of the "second Copernican revolution".

A Comparison of Three Metaphysics

In Europe, North America, and Australia one can find the cultural crisis exhibited in especially apparent form. Positivistic science is very influential, and exists side by side with more or less fundamentalist forms of Christianity. For those who are ultimately unsatisfied with either of these, the philosophical/religions of the East (particularly Buddhism, Vedanta, and Sufism) have over the past quarter century come to seem increasingly attractive.

Oversimplifying the situation somewhat for clarity, there appears today to be a contest between three kinds of metaphysical assumptions, each of which views consciousness somewhat differently, and each of which is a candidate for the prevailing belief system of the future world. These three are, in brief:

M-1 This is the prevailing metaphysic in modern science, including quantum physics. The basic stuff of the universe is assumed to be matter-energy. We learn about reality from studying the measurable world; the positivist assumption is that is the *only* way we can learn. Whatever consciousness is, it emerged out of matter (i.e. the brain) at the end of a long evolutionary process. Whatever can be learned about consciousness must ultimately be reconciled with the kind of knowledge we get from studying the physical processes of the brain.

M-2 An alternate metaphysic is dualistic. There are assumed to be two fundamentally different kinds of stuff in the universe—matter-energy stuff and mind-spirit stuff. The former is studied with the present tools of science; mind-spirit stuff must be explored in other ways more appropriate to it (e.g. inner, subjective exploration). Thus there develop, in essence, two complementary kinds of scientific knowledge. In areas where these clearly overlap (e.g. the role of the mind in healing; the field of psychic phenomena), complementary understandings ensue from the two approaches.

M-3 Yet a third kind of metaphysical assumption finds the ultimate stuff of the universe to be consciousness. Mind or consciousness is primary, and matter-energy arises in some sense out of mind. Individual minds are not separate (although individual brains may seem to be); they connect at some unconscious level. The physical world is to the greater mind as a dream image is to the individual mind. Ultimately reality is contacted, not through the physical senses, but through the deep intuition. Consciousness is not the end-product of material evolution; rather, consciousness was here first!

In brief summary, the three alternate sets of assumptions are:

Three Metaphysical Perspectives

M-1 MATERIALISTIC MONISM (Matter giving rise to mind)

M-2 DUALISM (Matter plus mind)

M-3 TRANSCENDENTAL MONISM (Mind giving rise to matter)

The fundamental change that appears to be taking place in Western society can be put in terms of these three sets of metaphysical assumptions. Essentially it amounts to a shift of dominant metaphysic from M-1 to M-3. At first thought this may seem as outrageous a proposition as the heliocentric universe did to many in early seventeenth-century Europe. M-3 seems quite foreign to the Western mind; at any rate it would have seemed so a generation ago. (It is not nearly so alien as it was a quarter of a century ago, if we may judge from such indicators as the kinds of books purchased, motion picture themes, meditative practices, participation in esoteric workshops and seminars, etc.)

Although Descartes postulated a dualistic universe, by the twentieth century science was rather firmly committed to an M-1 metaphysic. Within the past decade or so some scientists, recognizing that the extreme positivist position simply doesn't square with human experience, have been writing and speaking about the need to re-base science on an M-2 metaphysic. (Roger Sperry and Sir John Eccles have been mentioned above as two examples.)

Quietly, a number of scientists have been finding that when they take their total experience into account, the M-3 metaphysic fits best. Besides, that position seems to be implicit in the esoteric "perennial wisdom" of the world's spiritual traditions—a body of experience hardly to be ignored. For the present, the M-3 assumptions seem a long way from the picture of the world that emerges out of our various sciences. However in the long run, the M-3 position may very well be where science ends up.

We often hear that modern quantum theory has presented us with an altogether new scientific conception of man and his role nature. Classical physics had reduced the human individual to a machine whose every action and thought was preordained from the beginning of time. Such concepts as purposes, responsibilities, and values could find no place in this mechanical conception of human nature. Quantum theory has brought profound changes to the physicists' view of nature, in the process making the world seem less deterministic and more interconnected. Nonetheless, however much quantum physics might seem to release science from the bounds of strict determinism and causality, it could still only attempt to deal with consciousness in a reductionistic way; it is inherently M-1. The dualistic, M-2 approach urged by Sperry and Eccles represents a much more radical departure from customary science than does modern physics; so also would any attempt to base a science in the M-3 assumptions.

We need to recognize that although science in its present form essentially evolved within an M-1 *weltanschauung*, its findings are perfectly compatible with either the M-2 or the M-3 metaphysical assumptions. They are compatible, but in those views positivistic science is inherently incomplete as a picture of the universe.

It is furthermore critically important to recognize that we are not dealing with the question of *proving* the validity of any particular metaphysic. Reality is far too rich to be adequately captured in any conceptualization of it—scientific or theological or philosophical. We are capable of understanding aspects of reality that can never be adequately expressed in exact verbal form. It is not an appropriate question, then, to ask: Which of these three metaphysics is *true*? It is appropriate to ask, which one seems to make the best fit with the *totality* of human experience?

Let us now make some further observations about the nature of a science based in assumptions M-2 or M-3.

Toward a Complementary Science (The M-2 Approach)

Modern industrial society appears to be extraordinarily confused about values. With ever-increasing technological "know-how", it seems to be most unsure of what is ultimately worth doing. As Roger Sperry noted so emphatically, the particular form of science that industrial society developed did little to reduce this confusion.

In fact, one of the main contributing factors to the confusion has been the belief, once widely taught, that science does not inform about values. Since in the modern public mind scientific knowledge is generally equated with the totality of knowledge, this belief in value-free science tended to lead toward moral relativism if not nihilism.

Yet all the while it must have been apparent that the health sciences, for instance, deal very profoundly with value issues. Consider for example the mounting evidence that certain attitudes—e.g. resentment, frustration, rage, anxiety—are unwholesome in that they tend to interfere with the functioning of the body's immune system and foster ulcers, cancer, and other illness. Other attitudes—e.g. humor, joy, love—promote wellness and healing. But attitudes are intimately related to beliefs. Thus some beliefs (about oneself, one's relationship to others and to the planet) are wholesome while others are unwholesome. Some beliefs strongly encouraged by modern society are distinctly unwholesome; think, for instance, of the beliefs that underlie stress or feelings of alienation. While science may not have seemed to deal directly with values, the sciences relating to health and human development have the most profound value implications.

As noted earlier, conventional science developed around the desire to predict and control, and to manipulate the physical environment through technologies. Let us imagine what would be the characteristics of a complementary science that developed around a desire to guide human development and the search for

meaning. The table below is meant to be suggestive only, but it suffices to make the essential point: Such a complementary science would put great emphasis on exploring, in an appropriate manner, the vast realm of inner, subjective experience, including intimations of behind-the-scenes unconscious processes. In particular, it would pay special attention to one fundamental observation: *All societies, ancient or modern, primitive or sophisticated, have guided themselves by values and goals rooted in the experiences of "deep intuition" as reported by shamans, prophets, poets and mystics, and to varying degrees the entire population.*

A Comparison of Two Types of Knowledge Systems

<i>Primary focus</i>	<i>Characteristics</i>
Prediction and control; technology development	Emphasis on measureable information, quantified description, deterministic models, reductionistic explanations
Guiding human development, value choices, search for meaning	Concern with purpose, volition; emphasis on value issues, teleological explanations, models and metaphors involving holistic concepts; explorations of alternate states of consciousness, particularly "deep intuition"

Of these two complementary kinds of knowledge, modern society has emphasized the first, while certain traditional societies have particularly honored the second. But we need both kinds. One of the possible ways modern society might choose to proceed from here involves a more balanced development of the two kinds of knowledge, proceeding from a dualistic M-2 base.

Seeking Objectivity and Reliability

The first question likely to be asked about a proposed "complementary" science is: What about objectivity and reliability? How are these important criteria for scientific knowledge to be satisfied in a science that includes "consciousness as casual reality"? (Earlier attempts to deal with subjective experience—

such as introspectionism, the phenomenological approach and gestalt psychology—had failed to convince the scientific establishment that their methods could satisfy such criteria.)

Consider, for example, research on psychokinesis, or as a second example, research on facilitation of healing (of cancer, for instance) through such mental factors as positive attitudes, changing unconscious beliefs, inner imaging of a healthy body, etc. In both areas there has been careful work by competent researchers, with results that strongly suggest the existence of a genuine phenomenon. On the other hand, the research fails to meet strict standards of objectivity and reliability. Researchers with positive beliefs about the reality of the phenomena tend to get positive results, while more skeptical scientists tend to get negative results. And the results are erratic under what appear to be similar conditions.

Critics tend to interpret these characteristics of the research as evidence for the nonexistence of the phenomenon. But they can also be interpreted as indications of inappropriate demands for "objectivity" and "replicability". Once one postulates the possibility of an individual's mind affecting the environment at a distance, then it becomes apparent that the state of the experimenter's mind can influence research results, so strict objectivity is an impossibility. Furthermore, it is well known that human beings make choices at unconscious as well as conscious levels (e.g. addiction—an unconscious choice overruling a conscious one; or guilt feelings—a message from part of the unconscious mind that it disapproves of a choice made consciously). But in psychokinesis or cancer self-healing, unconscious as well as conscious choices are involved; the person may want one thing at one level of the mind and something else at another. With this uncontrollable factor entering in, replicability impossible.

But if strict interpretations of objectivity and of reliability through replicability are inappropriate in research on subjective experience, surely there are criteria something like these which *are* appropriate. Perhaps as the scientific exploration of these areas becomes more mature, something like the Buddhist ideal of "nonattachment" will replace the demand for strict objectivity.

And something like "trustworthiness" (perhaps on the basis of multiple imperfect tests) may replace strict reliability through replicability.

Thus, although this approach through developing a "complementary science" with a focus on consciousness has some associated difficulties, they seem potentially solvable. Let us now turn to the M-3 assumptions.

Emphasizing the "Perennial Wisdom" (The M-3 Path)

One of the most significant (although largely unheralded) developments of the twentieth century has been in the field of comparative religion. Aldous Huxley was the first to announce it in a popularized form, freed of weighty technical jargon—in *The Perennial Philosophy* (1945). Basically, the discovery was that when the various religions of the world and of history are compared, they are found to be of two types. Each religion has one or more *exoteric* or public forms. These are what we usually think of when the term religion is used. They are characterized by their cosmologies, their rituals, the architecture of their halls of worship, their revealed literature, and so on. But besides these exoteric forms, each spiritual tradition tends to have an *esoteric* or secret version, often known only to some inner circle, and usually involving some sort of meditative discipline. The forms of exoteric religions are fantastically diverse; typically they are dualistic in their theology. However, all of the esoteric traditions appear to be essentially the same or more precisely, appear to be based in some form of potentially universal spiritual experience. This common core has sometimes been referred to as the "perennial wisdom".

The modern world long assumed that there was a fundamental conflict between science and religion. For a time this conflict appeared as a series of battles over such issues as the age of the earth, the meaning of the fossil records, evolutionary theory, the Freudian re-interpretation of the human soul, etc. Religion always seemed to lose. Then as the world moved well into the twentieth century the conflict subsided, and people tended to live their religious lives apart from whatever they thought science was

telling them about the nature of reality. The price paid for this schizophrenia was that neither science nor religion fully satisfied the person's desires to *know*.

However, now it appears that *whereas there may indeed be conflict between dogmatic, extoeric religion and positivistic science, there is no necessary conflict at all between the esoteric "perennial wisdom" and a science based on an M-3 metaphysic.*

Let us not be misunderstood. Science has not, is nowhere near, and presumably never will "prove" the inner understanding we are referring to by the term "perennial wisdom". The "perennial wisdom", in turn, is not, and presumably never will be, articulated in a form such that it can be tested in a scientific manner. It may be, however, exemplified in a life, communicated (partially) in a situation of excellent rapport, and "proved" by living it.

What would a science based on the M-3 assumptions be like? It is no doubt premature to speculate very far, but some characteristics stand out.

It contrast to the confidence of the old science, that its measurements will eventually inform us about physical reality, the M-3 assumptions start from a different point. The dream analogy already mentioned briefly, provides a good way to get the "feel" of it. When we dream, there is typically a "story line"—events happen, and there seem to be some sorts of causal relationships among them. While we are dreaming, everything in the dream seems real enough. Then we awaken, and recognize that what felt so real was actually a dream. The law of causality is other than it seemed to be when we were asleep. In the dream it may have seemed that one event was the cause of something else and so on. To the awakened self it is apparent that "I, the dreamer" am cause of the dream—events, interrelationships, and all.

Try to imagine the analogue, however alien an idea it may seem to be at first. In our ordinary state the physical world seems real; various kinds of events take place, and there are apparent causal relationships between them. Some of these relationships are so dependable that we discover "scientific laws" to describe them.

(Only rarely does mind seem to intrude in the physical world in such a way that anomalous phenomenon occur). But suppose one "awakens" from the "dream" of the physical world. It then becomes apparent that the causality law is different than we thought (and were taught): "I, the dreamer" (or "We, the collective dreamer") am the cause of the events and the relationships. The out-of-consciousness collective/universal mind is creator of the world which the conscious individual mind experiences.

This way of looking at reality seems so strange to the Western educated mind that it is hard to even take it seriously. Observe what it suggests about the theory of evolution.

According to the generally accepted theory, the present universe began some fifteen billion years ago, with the "Big Bang". Three and a half billion years ago the first life appeared; two tenths of a billion years ago, the first mammals. Through mutations and natural selection, evolution has proceeded to create organisms of increasing complexity. Extremely recently (cosmologically speaking) the human being appeared, experiencing consciousness — a nonmaterial attribute somehow arising out of the material universe.

In sharp contrast, the M-3 metaphysic starts from a totally different assumption: Consciousness was here first. Evolution is pulled in certain preferred directions (e.g. increasing awareness, freedom, complexity) even as it is pushed by "survival of the fittest".

Many areas of science would no doubt be as drastically reformulated as evolutionary theory — the relationship between mind and healing, for example, or the understanding of creativity and intuition. On the other hand, most of the physical sciences and much of the biological sciences would remain unchanged.

Choose Your Metaphysic

It is futile to seek through research to answer the question "What metaphysic is correct?". Research findings cannot test or "prove" a metaphysic. The basic reason is that *the research methodology itself grows out of a metaphysic*, so the research tends to lead us full circle, back to that metaphysic.

Recognition of this limited bearing of research findings to resolve the metaphysical issue might seem to lead to a counsel of despair. Is it, after all, meaningful to assume a cultural evolution toward increasing knowledge? Or are we forever caught in this basic uncertainty of not knowing which metaphysic is "right"?

Perhaps the best position to take is that of freely interpreting research from the standpoints of all three metaphysics, honoring them all and exploring which is useful for what. That may solve the problem for science, which can afford to remain tentative indefinitely.

But it is a different matter for the individual. *Ultimately, each of us bets our life on some picture of reality*, recognizing (perhaps) that in a scientific sense at least, we can never know. What is the best way to make that bet?

The Roman Catholic scholar Pere A. G. Poulain gave three tests for transcendental experience, which will also suffice to test the choice of metaphysic: (1) Does it lead to sound ethical and moral values, to wholesome behavior and attitudes? (2) Is it in accord with the best of tradition — with the deepest wisdom of human experience down through the ages? (3) Does it feel deeply, intuitively "right" — and does it continue to feel so as time goes on?

We seem to be living at a time in history when vast numbers of individuals are making that choice — and betting their lives — in a way that in the end amounts to a new choice for society.

AN APPEAL TO ALL PEOPLE

(The following is an appeal made by leaders of nine religions in India to all people. The document was produced at the end of a remarkable two-day interreligious programme April 4-5, 1987 organised by the "Interreligions Forum for Communal Harmony" in Delhi. The signatories include the Dalai Lama and other distinguished religious leaders. A detailed report about the meeting is included in this issue-Ed.)

We, teachers of the many religions of India—from the Bahai, Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jain, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh and Zoroastrian communities—wish to speak to you in all humility, our brothers and sisters in all the religious communities of India, as also to those who profess no religion.

We have spent two days together in common prayer, mutual understanding and life-giving harmony. We have prayed together for peace and harmony, often in silence, at various shrines, temples, viharas, gurudwaras, mosques, churches and also at the Samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi.

Our sacred traditions agree in teaching respect for all, truthfulness and compassion, humility and generosity, forgiveness and self-sacrificing love. We teach the fostering and fulfilment of life—not its destruction. We are grieved and pained, however, that religion is used to inflame hatred and violence. Some of us have been guilty of fanning the flames of hatred and of inciting the low passions among our followers. Some of us join with politicians in whipping up feelings of exclusivism and self-glorification, and in spreading false notions about other communities. We have too often failed to do the right thing. Fear of being misunderstood or unpopular has stood in the way of our asserting the truth, and of calling in question the untrue statements of our colleagues in our own religions. As religious leaders we should show more courage in questioning dishonesty on the part of

our colleagues, and in championing other religious communities when they are oppressed or attacked.

We, therefore, appeal to you brothers and sisters, to refrain from all thoughts, words and actions that create hatred and enmity between individuals and communities. Millions are languishing in hunger, poverty and ignorance and under the threat of war. People exploit and oppress people. The sinister cloud of a nuclear holocaust hangs heavily over the whole of humanity. Let us gather our common spiritual forces in all religions to combat these negative forces which threaten to engulf all of us, to overcome evil by good, to banish darkness by bringing light, to dispel dishonesty by a firm grasp of truth, to eliminate violence and hatred by promoting patience and love.

It is sad that our religious communities have to resort to confrontation and show of strength to gain their ends. Where we have grievances against each other, as religions communities, let us resort to dialogue and concord, not to violence and hatred. Let us create inter-religious groups of men and women who can rise above communal narrow-mindedness and parochial loyalties.

We appeal to our brothers and sisters who are leaders of the political parties and religious groups to take a pledge, in the heart as well as in public, never to use religious sentiments to gain political advantage, never to manipulate the deep religious loyalties of our people to lit fires of hatred and destruction. We beseech you not to organize provocative mass demonstrations, not to encourage people to shout slogans of communal hatred, not to use religious festivals for fomenting riots and rabid violence. We appeal also to local religious functionaries—pastors, priests, poojaris, mullahs, rabbis, gurus, swamis—not to join hands with political elements which seek to exploit religion for parochial communal interests.

We appeal to you in humility our brothers and sisters in all religions: Let us make our faith and devotion a positive force. Let us hold fast to the noble values of mutual respect and compassion, human dignity and non-violence, love and kindness. Let us educate our youth to serve the whole of humanity and not just their own communities. Let us teach our

children to respect and care for people of all religions and no religion. Let us unite to care and serve the nation. Let us make our religious organizations creative forces for promoting peace with justice, concord with mutual respect, happiness for all human beings.

May peace and compassion dwell in the hearts and minds of all our people in this country and throughout the world. May the whole world be blessed.

Document

APPEAL TO JOINT EFFORTS

(International Forum "For a Nuclear-free-weapon World, for the Survival of Humanity" Religious Section Moscow, 14-16 February 1987)

Unified in heart and mind, we, leaders of Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, and Shintoist communities in Africa, North and South America, Asia, the Caribbean, Eastern and Western Europe, and the Middle East, appeal to people of faith around the world, to all people of good will, to the leaders of the nations: for God's sake and for the survival and dignity of humanity, lay aside your prejudices, your enmities, your arms and lift up together the banner of peace with justice for all.

We, 215 persons of faith, have come together across the barriers of race, creed, and ideology from 56 nations to consider the tragic and urgent plight of our globe. Together, we are reminded of how small and fragile is this beautiful world entrusted to our care. We shed tears to see it at the brink of possible nuclear destruction, to see so many of its inhabitants suffering the man-made plagues of war, famine and pestilence. We share a common anxiety about its fate.

The decision of the United Nations to declare 1986 the International Year of Peace awakened new hopes. Only two months before, the leaders of the USSR and the USA had agreed that there could be no winners in a nuclear war and to begin new negotiations to curb the nuclear arms race. At the same time, more and more people have committed themselves to the cause

of peace, often out of religious convictions. Hopeful proposals have been made, setting out new modes of political thinking and new principles of relations between states in a nuclear age which give priority to universally accepted human values. Sweeping new proposals have been made to eliminate nuclear weapons altogether. At Reykjavik, near agreement was reached to reduce drastically current stockpiles and nuclear missile deployment.

Yet all these hopes have been dashed. The nuclear arms race threatens more imminently to spread into space, and conventional weapons traders grow ever richer by feeding the flames of war in several terribly destructive regional conflicts. New nuclear disasters have reminded us that human beings have created a technology that can exceed their ability to control it. The arms race continues, both in quality and in scope, with disastrous consequences, especially for the poor whose meagre resources it drains at an increasing pace.

And yet we do not despair. We continue to believe in the power of prayer, and together we trust that God will lead humanity out of this wilderness. We believe in wise actions guided by the sages. It is not too late to replace the threat or use of armed force with dialogue. It is not too late to return to the policy of detente and cooperation and to develop new confidence and trust among peoples divided by irrational hatred and enmity. It is not too late to develop a shared notion of common security among the inescapably interdependent nations of the world. The time has come for concrete actions before it does become too late. People of religion have special roles to play, among them:

- promoting unity among the peoples;
- increasing contacts across lines of division;
- improving the spiritual and devotional life of human communities;
- helping to eliminate prejudicial enemy images; and
- intensifying education for peace.

Many of us have been meeting together in peace gatherings for decades building bonds of trust and confidence among ourselves. Our experience is a hopeful one. We call upon the policy makers

and leaders of the nations to commit themselves as well to continuing dialogue. Urgent steps are necessary now to end the arms race. But a commitment to stay the course is essential if the shared aspirations of humankind for the elimination of all nuclear weapons is ultimately to be realized.

We appeal especially to the leaders of the principal nuclear nations to:

- declare once and for all that the alternative of nuclear war is immoral and humanly unacceptable;
- renounce the doctrines of nuclear deterrence and Mutually Assured Destruction;
- respect without question existing nuclear weapons treaties such as the ABM Treaty;
- proceed immediately to conclude new treaties in consonance with the hope for a nuclear-free world rekindled in Reykjavik.

While we have not come here to align ourselves with the policies of any particular nation we applaud on its merits the unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing as a confidence-building measure of the highest order. It deserves a positive response. All nuclear states should enter into a common moratorium calling a halt now to all nuclear testing. We also believe the goal of ridding the world of nuclear weapons, by mutually-agreed stages, by the year 2000 is necessary, urgent and achievable. But for either of these things to happen, all the peoples of the world, especially the citizens of the major nuclear powers, must engage in renewed massive efforts. The unilateral actions taken already by some states to reduce their military forces and budgets are welcome and encouraging.

We appeal to all to commit themselves unalterably to this task of building the basis for common security today. Time has come for us to ask the ancient questions: If not me, who? If not now, when?

May God make us faithful stewards of this world which we hold in trust for future generations, and guide us all in the blessed paths of peace.

News and Notes

Towards Peace and Harmony Meeting of Religious Leaders and Scholars, Delhi.

In early April Delhi witnessed a quiet but unique event. As the country was bleeding from communal violence, provocative mass demonstrations and counter rallies, leaders and scholars of all the nine religions in India met together to pray for peace and reflect on the problem of communal disharmony in this country.

On 4th April His Holiness the Dalai Lama inaugurated a two-day programme at the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library Auditorium of Teen Murti House. In the morning session chaired by Dr. Karan Singh, leading spokesman of all religious communities in India were present on the dais. Among them were Mr. Muhammed Yunus Saleem, Archbishop Angelo Fernandes, Muni Sushil Kumarji, Mr. S.S. Uban, Dastur Minochar Homji, Swami Chidananda, Metropolitan Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios, Maulana Abdul Irfan Nadwi, Muni Mahendra Kumarji, Mr. Ezra Kolet, Rajyogini Brahmakumari Mohini, Swami Gokulananda, Dr. H.M. Munje. They represented Bahais, Buddhists, Christians, Hindus, Jains, Jews, Muslims, Sikhs and Zoroastrians.

The Dalai Lama in his moving inaugural address recalled his visit to India in 1956 on the occasion of the 2500th anniversary of the birth of Lord Buddha. He had seen at that time a country free from violence, communal disharmony and an excessive concern for VIP security. Appealing to the hearts of all religious people, the Dalai Lama said that no single religion could cater to all the spiritual needs of human beings. So it is good that there are many religions which add to the spiritual wealth of humanity. His Holiness compared this to the varieties of food we need for the different needs of individuals. All religions with their fundamental philosophical differences aim at the same goal, namely the betterment of humanity.

All the distinguished speakers spoke about the emphasis their respective traditions placed on mutual respect, compassion and self-sacrificial love. No religious tradition taught hatred of others or self-seeking parochialism. Several speakers condemned the present trend of certain politico-communal elements exploiting the genuine religious sentiments of people to create enmity and hatred among people.

Messages of greetings to the meeting from Jagadguru Sankarcharya of Kanchi and Mother Teresa were read out at the inaugural ceremony.

The afternoon session chaired by Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios was devoted to an analysis of the present impasse of conflict and communal violence in India. A general discussion followed.

On Sunday the 5th of April the Dalai Lama and other religious leaders flanked by a large gathering of people sat in prayer and quiet meditation at the Gandhi Samadhi at Raj Ghat. Prayers and chants from all religions rose in the serene sky above the samadhi of the great martyr for peace, justice and freedom. It was a moving sight to see hundreds of little children, women and men sitting under the scorching sun and praying fervently for peace and goodwill among people.

After two hours of praying together, a group of leaders started a unique pilgrimage. They visited and prayed, often in silence, in the houses of worship like Lal Jain Mandir, Jama Masjid, Buddha Vihara, Cathedral Church of Redemption and Ramayana Vidya-peeth. In several places of worship, devotees joined the group in praying.

The highlight of the day was the grand reception accorded to His Holiness the Dalai Lama and other leaders at the Gurudwara Bangla Sahib. They were honoured with the traditional *Saropa*. Speaking to the large gathering of devotees assembled on the occasion, His Holiness wished sikh community all success. After the ceremony the visiting group joined the famous *Gurū Ka Langar* (common lunch) with the community. To most of the visiting lead-

ers this was a unique experience. Sharing food with the *sangat* was a preeminent act of spiritual communion.

In the afternoon the leaders and scholars held a special meeting at the India International Centre to consider the nature of the follow up work. The session was chaired by Bishop Maqbul Caleb of Delhi. The participants unanimously requested His Holiness the Dalai Lama to lend his kind patronage to the continuing work. It was decided that the "Inter-religious Forum for Communal Harmony" which sponsored the two-day programme should continue as a co-ordinating body and to work out the details of the follow-up programme. Venerable Daboom Tulku, Director, Tibet House and co-convener had welcomed earlier His Holiness and the participants. Rev. Dr. K.M. George of the National Council of Churches and the secretary of the Forum presented a draft appeal of religious leaders to all people. It was discussed and approved with some modifications. This joint communique appealed to people to refrain from all acts, words and thoughts that inflame hatred and violence in the name of religion. It called for sincere support from all religious bodies and devotees to the process of nation-building and requested people of all religions and of no religion to foster and sustain the forces of peace and justice.

In the morning of the 4th April, prior to the inaugural session, Fr. Dr. G. Koovackal, Co-convener of the Forum took a group of leaders to a meeting with the President Giani Zail Singh. The President expressed his great trust in movements like this and said that this was a timely initiative. He deplored the fact that the mass media were interested only in negative happenings like communal violence, killing and looting while positive movements for peace and harmony from the side of religions were often ignored by them.

The two days during which the religious leaders and scholars lived together, talked to each other and shared common meals demonstrated the great potential of religions to create peace and concord and radiate blessings to the whole world instead of disharmony and destructive feelings.

Greece : Church, State at Odds on Church Land

ATHENS—A government proposal to acquire 130,000 hectares of land (mostly forests, meadows, and farmland) controlled by [Eastern Orthodox] Church of Greece, and then turn them over to peasant co-operatives (which tend to support the governing socialist party) has drawn strong opposition from church leaders. The bill would also make half the membership of parish and diocesan councils government appointees. To protest, priests were not to lead church services marking the Greek national day (25 March). (The value of church property and land in Greece is estimated at about 5 billion US dollars).

The situation also prompted a message to Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou and Parliament President Ioannis Alevras from World Council of Churches General Secretary Emilio Castro. Acknowledging Greek government assistance to the church, Castro suggests the proposal be "suspended", and that "intensive, constructive dialogue" continue with church leaders.

He describes the church as instrumental in building modern Greece—the church played a major role in the struggle for independence from Turkey, which came in 1821—and says it still plays a "central role" in Greek life. (Most Greeks are Orthodox). "In difficult moments of modern Greek history", he continues, "the church did not hesitate to share her property with peasants, refugees, and deprived people. ..."

Castro therefore urges dialogue "with the church to guarantee her that in full autonomy, and in accordance with ecclesiastical [church] law, she continues her pastoral, diaconal [service] ministry." Citing "manifold needs of her flock and of a large sector of society", and the need to "maintain her spiritual presence in Europe and the Third World where her moral and material contribution is solicited", Castro adds that the church "should have the necessary means to carry out this ministry".

Reaction to Vatican Document : Concern on Absolutes, Ecumenism

This item is based on material from Religious News Service.

NEW YORK—Ecumenical responses to the Vatican document

(released 10 March) on reproductive technology ranged from solid support to a variety of questions about how "the rules" will be interpreted in practical situations. The text rejects, as "morally illicit", virtually all forms of artificial conception in which human life is generated outside the body. This includes surrogate motherhood and in-vitro fertilization (the "test-tube baby" process) and most procedures involving artificial insemination. To be moral, the document says, human procreation must result from "the act of conjugal love".

J. Robert Nelson, a Methodist (UMC) minister who is director of the Institute of Religion at the Texas Medical Center in Houston noted the document uses "proportionate" and "disproportionate" in discussing some points; these words, he said, will be the basis of ecumenical discussion of the issues. In general, he said he supports the "absolute principles" in the document, but not as hard-and-fast rules: "I don't believe it's waffling. It's simply taking into account the reality of human existence".

Millard Erickson, dean and professor of systematic theology at Bethel Theological Seminary in St Paul (Minnesota), said the Vatican statement is based on a natural-law ethic, which is difficult to maintain because "unnatural methods of medicine" are universally used. Barbara DeMartino Swyhart, dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the California University of Pennsylvania, said surrogate mothering has biblical roots in the story of Sarah and Hagar, in which Hagar was allowed to bear offspring for Sarah who was unable to conceive.

China : World Council of Churches delegation visits

BEIJING—A delegation of the Geneva-based World Council of Churches, headed by WCC General Secretary Emilio Castro, arrived here (21 March) on the first leg of an official visit to China (through 30 March). The group planned talks with Chinese church and government representatives, here and in Nanjing and Shanghai. The group was invited by the China Christian Council, which groups about half of the country's Christian minority. (Chinese Catholics, who cut links with the Vatican in the 1950s,

have a separate organization. Meetings were also scheduled between its representatives and the delegation). For three decades until the early 1980s, Christians in China were largely cut off from international ecumenical contacts. This is the first official visit by a WCC general secretary, though Castro's predecessor, Philip Potter, made a private visit to China shortly before he retired, in 1984. With Castro on this trip were Ruth Sovik, WCC deputy general secretary; Ninan Koshy, director of the WCC Commission of the Churches on International Affairs; and Park Kyung Seo, WCC secretary for Asia.

FRG : Aids concern alters communion practice

MUNICH—The opening eucharist at the meeting of the synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Bavaria (29 March) was scheduled to allow those who receive the eucharistic elements to receive the wine by dipping a piece of bread into it, instead of drinking it from a common cup. The practice, uncommon here was prompted by "growing, if unjustified, fears" that those drinking from the same cup could spread or catch the Aids virus.

Kenya : Pastor transferred after sermon displeases president

NAIROBI—Timothy Njoya, a minister at St Andrew's a prominent congregation here of the Presbyterian Church of East Africa, has been transferred to a rural parish in Nyeri, about 100 kilometres north of here, effective next month. In a sermon last October, Njoya urged the government to invite to a meeting all dissidents, malcontents, critics, fugitives, and anyone else with a grievance or complaint, to say what they think. Copies of the sermon were given to the congregation. Subsequently, Kenyan President Daniel arap Moi observed that "a certain church" was distributing "subversive literature". PCEA Moderator George Wanjau called Njoya's transfer "normal".

USSR : Permission granted to import commentary, print Bible

MOSCOW—The Soviet Union has okayed importation of 5000, 15-volume sets of a Russian translation of the Bible commentary

by William Barclay. The project is a joint effort of the Baptist World Alliance, Mennonite Central Committee, and All Union Council of Evangelical Christians—Baptists. A Baptist report calls the approval "without precedent", and "the latest development in a campaign for openness ("glasnost")" in the Soviet Union. Also approved was the printing of 100,000 Bibles by the Russian Orthodox Church in 1987.

Romania : International meeting on Bible work

BUCHAREST—A delegation led by Hans Florin, head of the London-based Europe and Middle East Regional Centre of the United Bible Societies, visited Romania in February to consider new approaches to Bible work in the country. The delegation met with Eastern Orthodox, Lutheran, Reformed, and Baptist representatives. Among other things, it was agreed that UBS will support printing by the Orthodox of a jubilee edition of the Romanian Bible of 1668 (which Romanian Orthodox Patriarch Teoctist said would be the cultural event of 1988 in Romania). UBS is to provide paper for printing Bibles in Romanian for the Baptists, and to support the importation of Bibles in German (5000 copies) for the Lutherans, and in Hungarian (19,000 copies) for the Reformed. A plan to reprint 10,000 copies of a Romanian Bible for ecumenical use was also discussed, as were proposals for a modern, ecumenical translation into Romanian, and an edition in Braille. [EPS]

Roman Catholic Church Condemns Genetic Manipulation

In a 40-page document released here on March 10, the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith has also condemned all types of test-tube births, surrogate motherhood and experimentation on living embryos and said the human body "could not be treated as a mere complex of tissues and organs".

The document, entitled "Instruction on respect for human life in its origin and on the dignity of procreation-Replies to certain questions of the day," urged government authorities and legislators to be watchful of new biomedical techniques because "an uncon-

trolled application of such techniques could lead to unforeseeable and damaging consequences for civil society.”

It said, however, that prenatal diagnosis is permissible if the methods used safeguard the life and integrity of the embryo and the mother. “But this diagnosis is gravely opposed to the moral law when it is done with the thought of possibly inducing an abortion depending upon the results,” it said.

Serious offence

The ‘Instruction’ warned that the modern techniques if left unchecked could lead to a system of radical eugenics, in other words, the attempts to improve the human species through the control of hereditary factors in mating, and would constitute an act of violence and serious offence to the quality, dignity and fundamental rights of the human person.

“No biologist or doctor can reasonably claim, by virtue of his scientific competence, to be able to decide on people’s origin and destiny,” the document said in the introduction. “It would be illusory to claim that scientific research and its applications are morally neutral. Science without conscience can only lead to man’s ruin.”

The Congregation said the document was put together over several years with the help of scientists, theologians and Church officials.

“The transmission of human life is entrusted by nature to a personal and conscious act and as such is subject to the all-holy laws of God—immutable and inviolable laws which must be recognised and observed,” the document said. “For this reason one cannot use means and follow methods which could be licit in the transmission of the life of plants and animals.”

The ‘Instruction’ said the Church was against all forms of test-tube births because it is “immoral to produce human embryos destined to be exploited as disposable biological material”, and because fertilisation is realised through the actions of third parties

like doctors and biologists, “establishing the domination of technology over the origin and destiny of the human person.”

Child, gift of God

The church, the document said, could not ignore the “legitimate aspirations of sterile couples” to have a child. But the child is not an object to which one has a right, nor can be considered an object of ownership, it clarified. “Rather a child is a gift of God and as such couples should not use a morally illicit method to acquire a child.”

The ‘Instruction’, however, did not rule out technical means that facilitated fertilisation. It said such facilities were morally acceptable, but did not elaborate.

The document further said that a new life began from the time that the ovum was fertilised and that new life was neither that of the father nor of the mother—rather it is the life of a new human being with his own growth and that the embryo must be treated as a person. The “corpses” of human embryos and fetuses must be respected just as the remains of other human beings and not to be subjected to mutilation, the document said.

Any medical treatment of or surgical intervention on a foetus, even using experimental drugs and methods, can be acceptable if the objective is the healing of various maladies such as those stemming from chromosome defects. But any other intervention on embryos which is not directly therapeutic is illicit the document said.

Surrogate motherhood

Surrogate motherhood, it said, represented “an objective failure to meet the obligations of maternal love, of conjugal fidelity and of responsible motherhood: It offends the dignity of the right of the child to be conceived, carried in the womb, brought into the world and brought up by his own parents”.

“Every child which comes into the world,” the new document said, “must be accepted as a living gift of the goodness of God and must be brought up with love.”

"The new 'Instruction' is based on two principles espoused by the Church—that the life of every human being must be respected from the moment of conception and that the only way to give birth to a child is through natural sexual acts between married couples.

(SAR News)

National Consultation on Ecumenical Formation

A National Consultation on "Theological Education and Ecumenical Formation in India" was held in Jnana Deepa Vidyapeeth, Poona, from February 16 to 18 1987 in which about 40 theological educators from Roman Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Churches participated and held discussions. Papers were presented on (1) the present status of Ecumenical relationship among Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant Churches, (2) Existing Ecumenical context in India, (3) Existing Ecumenical cooperation in theological education (4) Sharing of some issues and concerns from the Vatican and WCC documents on Christian Unity and Ecumenical Formation and (5) Prospects for Ecumenical Cooperation, Formation and sharing in Theological Education in India.

As the first national consultation, this meeting was sponsored by Board of Theological Education of the Senate of Serampore College (BTESSC) and the Roman Catholic Theological Institutions in India. In an earlier preliminary meeting held on September 25, 1985 between the representatives of BTESSC, three Protestant and three Catholic Faculties, Dr. Somen Das of United Theological College and Dr. Joseph Pathrapankal of Dharmaram Vidya Kshetram were authorized to organize an all-India meeting in which theological educators from all over India could be invited to discuss ways and means of cooperation in theological education and ecumenical formation.

The meeting as such was a great success as it gave an opportunity for the participants to discuss in an atmosphere of freedom and cordiality the various aspects of ecumenical cooperation in theological education. The need was felt of reviving the ecumenical climate in our country and the theological institutions

were seen to have a great role to play in maintaining the ecumenical atmosphere among the clergy and the people of God at large. A committee was set up for the follow up of such a project and the consultation concluded with the passing of a statement and some recommendations and resolutions about future collaboration in theological education.

(J. Pathrapankal)

Can women be included in foot-washing?

WASHINGTON (NC) — Women can be included in the Catholic Church's Holy Thursday foot-washing ceremony, says a memo sent to the U.S. Bishops in March by the Bishops' Committee on Liturgy.

The inclusion of both men and women in the rite emphasizes Christ's "humble service" to his followers and "the service that should be given by all the faithful to the Church and to the world," the memo said.

Last year Bishop Anthony Bevilacqua of Pittsburgh provoked a nationally publicized controversy when he told his priests that only men's feet could be washed. The governing liturgical rule, he said, spoke of those chosen for the rite as "viri," a Latin term which refers only to males.

Before Bishop Bevilacqua's order, parishes in many parts of the country routinely involved both men and women in the foot-washing ceremony. The ceremony imitates Christ's washing of his apostles' feet at the Last Supper, as a sign of his love for them and service to them.

The memo to the Bishops said the Vatican is still studying the question of including women in the rite, along with a number of other questions regarding the Holy Week liturgy, and it has not yet given a definitive answer to inquiries about the issue.

In the meantime, the "variation" in the United States of using both men and women "is an understandable way of accentuating

the evangelical command...that all members of the Church must serve one another in love," the memo said.

Bishop Beliacqua, who received an advance copy of the memo, sent it out to all parishes in his diocese with a covering letter urging pastors to exercise "prudent pastoral judgement" as to "the most appropriate manner" of celebrating the rite in their own parishes.

He said pastors could follow either the more traditional rubric excluding women or the "variation" that has grown up as a custom in the United States. In either case, he said, he hoped they would celebrate the rite in a way that "will promote the ecclesial unity and Christian charity" which are central themes of that and other Holy Week services.

The memo to the country's Bishops also carried a warning against liturgical rites becoming a source of division. "The liturgy is always an act of ecclesial unity and Christian charity, of which the Holy Thursday foot-washing rite is an eminent sign," it said.

Episcopal appointments in Hungary require government approval, and Archbishop Paskai, who will now head the nearly 1,000-year-old Archdiocese of Esztergom, is well-known to authorities. Observers expect him to continue the "small steps" policy of cooperating with communist authorities to improve the Church's position which marked the reign of his predecessor, Cardinal Laszlo Lekai.

Cardinal Lekai died last June after serving as Primate of the communist-controlled country for 10 years.

The Vatican made the announcement March 6 in a flurry of Hungarian episcopal appointments. At the same time, Pope John Paul accepted the resignation of two other Hungarian Bishops for reasons of age, the Vatican announced.

The appointments follow a Feb. 19 meeting between Prime Minister Gyorgy Lazar and the Pope at the Vatican.

Before his appointment, Archbishop Paskai, a 49-year-old Franciscan served for five years as Coadjutor Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Kalocsa, Hungary. He was a professor of philosophy and later rector at Budapest's central seminary until he was appointed Bishop Coadjutor of Veszprem in 1978. In 1979 he became Bishop of the diocese.

Catholic ecumenical dialogue in progress

VATICAN CITY (NC)—Catholic ecumenical dialogue with other Churches indicates progress in several areas from theology to authority, a Vatican survey shows. Authored by members of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, the survey was published in the English-language edition of the Vatican's newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano*. It examined the progress achieved so far in dialogues with the World Council of Churches, Lutherans, Baptists, Pentecostals, Methodists, Anglicans, Reformed Churches and the Disciples of Christ. The survey was published Jan. 19.

Ecumenism should be a "rediscovery of the Church," Msgr. Basil Meeking, under-secretary of the Vatican agency, wrote in the newspaper. If ecumenical relations are focused "exclusively" on "social activism or in pragmatic collaboration" rather than theological dialogue, they risk "boredom and lack of purpose," he added.

Here are some of the survey conclusions:

—Cooperation is continuing with the World Council of Churches "in fairly satisfactory way" given the differences between "a universal Church which raises quite special claims about its uniqueness" and a world wide council of local Churches.

There is continuing participation in the Catholic-world council Joint Working Group which examines such problems as "new sources of divisions among Christians".

These include conflicts which "may arise from ethical issues and the stands Churches take on them, and from the developments in science and technology."

—The international Lutheran-Catholic dialogue is now focusing on themes of justification, ecclesiology and sacramentality. On the national level, the German commission has reported on justification, and a recent German commission document concerning condemnations were based on “misunderstandings” or “no longer apply to the doctrine and practice” of the Churches today.

“Some condemnations however allow no discernible consensus even today,” he added.

—A 14 point Pentecostal — Catholic discussion of theological differences has led to increased conversation about the theological aspects of the Church.”

He said the direction of the discussion “shows a maturing in Pentecostal theological reflection” and a deepening of understanding and awareness on both sides. Through the discussion “it has been possible again to raise the question of proselytism by some Pentecostals in certain countries and to find a ready understanding and a sense of ecumenical responsibility.”

This August the commission is to meet in Venice, Italy to discuss the Church and Sacramentality.

—Baptist-Catholic relations have focused on mutual understanding and the identification of “existing prejudices.”

There is “a wide diversity of understanding” on some aspects of the dialogue such as the Baptist use of the term evangelism in contrast to the Catholic use of the term evangelization.

In July 1987 the Catholic-Baptist dialogue is scheduled to have as its theme “Our Witness in the World.”

—The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission is waiting for final approval by both Churches of two documents—the final report on “Eucharist, Ministry and Authority, and “Salvation and the Church.”

In November 1986, the Anglican General Synod responded favourably to the statements on Eucharist and ministry but called for “further study” of the report on authority. The report “opens up the possibility of Anglican recognition of the universal primacy of the Bishop of Rome.”

Chair in Christianity at Madras University

MADRAS (SAR News)—The Madras Roman Catholic Archdiocese with the collaboration of other dioceses of Tamil Nadu, has established a Chair in Christianity at Madras University. It will begin M. Phil and Ph.D studies from the academic year 1987-1988.

The Chair is established in response to the call given by the then vice-chancellor Dr. Santappa who said that the University would welcome initiatives on the part of religious denominations to establish Chairs or Departments to promote study and research into major religious traditions.

With the launching of a Chair in Christianity the research scholars and interested students will have opportunities for a study of Christianity in a University setting, said Fr. Thomas George, Head of Chair in Christianity.

According to him the Chair has been established to promote study and research in Christianity in an open, intellectually stimulating environment and aid dialogue among intellectuals of different religions. It will also offer courses in interdisciplinary areas of research such as religion and psychology, religion and the social sciences, religious pluralism, eastern and western approaches to theology and spirituality.

The vision of the Chair is to present Christianity in an intellectually honest and vigorous fashion, in constant dialogue with non-Christian intellectuals and other religious representatives, he said.

Its special focus, he continued, is Indian and contemporary Christian spirituality. “This seems best to summarize the Indian Church’s identity within the Universal Church a call to be fully Indian and deeply Christian, committed citizens of a land of ancient cultures with a Christian view of today’s world. Spirituality seems to be an area where India has something deep and time-tested to offer to the world”.

The Chair, plans to offer a Ph.D, M.Phil, and M.A. in Christia-

nity. There will also be a diploma course in Christianity aimed at various target groups.

A feature of the study programme will include certificate courses, lectures and visiting scholar status, a position offered to scholars working on research, especially postdoctoral Fellows. There will also be special students-full time students at another recognised University wanting to attend lectures or make use of the facilities available at the Chair.

THE STAR OF THE EAST

THE STAR OF THE EAST is an Indian Orthodox ecumenical quarterly, published under the editorial responsibility of Metropolitan Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios of Delhi. It is the continuation of an occasional journal carrying the same name originally published by the late Rev. Dr. C. T. Eapen of the Orthodox Syrian Church of India. The journal deals with contemporary issues of ecumenism, especially from the perspective of the Orthodox Churches, and will carry news about the major events in the life of these Churches.

All correspondence, articles, news, exchange periodicals, books for review and subscription enquiries may be addressed to :

The Editor
The Star of the East
The Delhi Orthodox Centre
2, Tughlakabad Institutional Area
New Delhi-110 062

Single copy in India	Rs. 6.00
„ Outside India	\$ 1.00

Annual Subscription Rates :

In India	Rs. 20.00
Outside India (By Seamail)	\$ 6.00
(By Airmail)	\$ 8.00
For Indian Theological Students	Rs. 12.00

Life Subscription :

(In India)	Rs. 200.00
(Outside India)	\$ 1000.00